DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 479 552 IR 022 158

AUTHOR	Hudson, Shirley A.; Kim, Young H.
TITLE	MBA Students' Satisfaction with Technology Changes from Traditional to Online Courses.
PUB DATE	2002-10-00
NOTE	9p.; In: E-Learn 2002 World Conference on E-Learning in Corporate, Government, Healthcare, & Higher Education. Proceedings (7th, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, October 15-19, 2002); see IR 022 093.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE), P.O. Box 3728, Norfolk, VA 23514. Tel: 757-623-7588; e-mail: info@aace.org; Web site: http://www.aace.org/DL/.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS
DESCRIPTORS	Business Education; *Computer Assisted Instruction; *Computer Mediated Communication; Conventional Instruction; *Distance Education; Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Instructional Effectiveness; Masters Programs; Nontraditional Education; Online Systems; *Student Attitudes; *Student Reaction
IDENTIFIERS	*Student Satisfaction

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the level of perception and satisfaction of students in online distance learning graduate courses for daytime Regular MBA (Regular) and evening Weekend Professional MBA (Weekend) programs. Distance learning delivery methods have changed over the years, but not perceptions. This study attempted to identify if there are any significant differences in Regular and Weekend students' assessments of demographics, personal preferences and habits, technological proficiency and evaluations (course, online course structure, instructors) in their online course experience. This research has shown that online audio chat and text chat have a positive effect on students' learning. The data also showed that moving from traditional to online had no undesirable outcome on students. Working with students to understand the benefits, dangers and limitations helps them adjust to online course environments. (Contains 10 references.) (Author)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G.H. Marks

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

MBA Students' Satisfaction with Technology Changes from Traditional to Online Courses

Shirley A. Hudson, Ph.D., CPCM
School of Business Decision Sciences Department
Clark Atlanta University
United States
dr_hudson@mindspring.com

Young H. Kim, Ph.D.
School of Business Decision Sciences Department
Clark Atlanta University
United States
ykim@sbus.cau.edu

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 479 552

IR022158

Abstract: The purpose of this study was to investigate the level of perception and satisfaction of students in online distance learning graduate courses for daytime Regular MBA (Regular) and evening Weekend Professional MBA (Weekend) programs. Distance learning delivery methods have changed over the years but not perceptions. This study attempted to identify if there are any significant differences in Regular and Weekend students' assessments of demographics, personal preferences and habits, technological proficiency and evaluations (course, online course structure, instructors) in their online course experience. This research has shown that online audio chat and text chat have a positive effect on students' learning. The data also showed that moving from traditional to online had no undesirable outcome on students. Working with students to understand the benefits, dangers and limitations helps them adjust to online course environments.

Introduction

The business world is changing and so is the delivery method to MBA students. With the recent growth and development of distance learning, online teaching has become a method of helping students to take their required load of courses even those who might otherwise provide a time conflict. As one of the predominantly African American business schools first accredited by the AACSB International (American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business), the Clark Atlanta University School of Business in Atlanta, Georgia (hereafter referred to as CAU Business School) changed computer based information systems courses from traditional to online. This process of development took a three-year effort.

CAU Business School has maintained the standards of a high-quality institution that produced the best-projected return on investment as a two-year MBA program, according to rankings published in Business Week (October 1998). This study discusses transitions: face-to-face meeting in the classroom (1999); one meeting in the classroom and one online with text chat (2000); no face-to-face classroom meetings, online course with text and audio chats (2001). A survey was conducted at the end of each semester. The cross tabs' statistics and measures of association (Pearson chi-square) were computed to determine if there are any significant differences between students' perceptions and satis faction with their online course experiences in Regular and Weekend programs.

Literature Review

California Distance Learning Project (CDLP) (2001, ¶ 1) in its definition of Distance Learning states, "The implementation of DL is a process which uses available resources and will evolve to incorporate emerging technologies." Martinez (September 2000) stated, "You can achieve the same instructional objectives for everyone – it's just that you do it in a different way for people with different learning orientations" (p. 40). Many universities have committed to offering distance-learning courses. According to Langford, Farinella, Weeks & Hobbs (2001, Spring), "It seems clear that the implementation of distance learning offerings has become part of the strategic commitment at many university and college campuses" (p. 75).

Distance learning has increased in the academic environment. Ron Burnett (2000), President of the Vancouver, British Columbia stated:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

> In academic circles, there has been a 72 percent increase in the number of distance-learning programs, many of them Web-based courses, with 1.6 million students making use of them during the 1997-'98 academic year alone. The market is expected to grow to $1.6 billion by 2002 (p. 122).

Burnett also believes that "the combined market for corporate and academic distance learning is expected to surpass $11.5 billion by 2003" (Burnett, 2000, p. 122).

Further research is needed to gain insight into students' perceptions of online courses. With that thought in mind this research began in the Spring of 1999. The research involved offering online graduate Management Information Systems courses. Since no courses were online in CAU Business School, the researcher was given permission to pilot this research. These courses were taught in the Decision Sciences Department of CAU Business School. This paper is an account of the transition and students' perception of online courses.

Formal learning is no longer confined to a classroom or a school day. Distance Education has become the wave of present and future learning modes. According to Rex Adams, Dean of Fuqua School of Business at Duke University (2000 ¶1), "Even for top business schools, using the Internet to supplement classroom learning is a relatively new endeavor." (http://www.fastcompany.com/learning/braintrust/radams.html) Adams states "..... most of the world's best business schools are moving at full speed to take advantage of this medium's ability to extend teaching capabilities." (http://www.fastcompany.com/learning/braintrust/radams.html)

According to Culross (Spring 2000), "While few colleges and universities are likely to replace face-to-face instruction totally with computer-based instruction, more and more faculty will opt to teach online courses or to offer portions of their courses through the Web" (p. 38). Terry Neil (February 2001) stated, " With the advent of new educational and training technologies augmented by the Internet, distance learning is a viable option in meeting the needs of today's learning-hungry, but time-pressed students" (p.64). Ed Kazlauskas, Rossier School of Education states:

> ... approaches include examining distance learning from a management perspective at the macro-level, e.g. revenue streams or academic/administrative policies, from a technology perspective, e.g. web-based course management packages such as Blackboard, Mallard, and Web-CT, or from an instructional design perspective, e.g. learning strategies employed in the distance learning approach. But rather than focusing on these as a lens to examine the field, it may be more meaningful for faculty to examine distance learning in terms of the participants involved (2000-2001, ¶2).

This study involved Regular and Weekend students. Weekend program provides time pressed students with an opportunity to upgrade their skills. Weekend Professional students are more experienced and diverse. Stevens (1999) stated, "Web-based, distance-learning MBA programs give busy tech managers an opportunity to hone their business skills and knowledge while remaining at their job" (p. 31). This method of learning is not only being used by tech managers, but by working professionals as a whole.

Technology and instructions designed for students and instructor interaction in online courses can be as effective as traditional courses. Parviz & Ludwig (November 1999) stated, "Research comparing distance education to traditional classroom instruction shows that teaching at a distance can be as effective as traditional instruction" (p. 114). Student-instructor interaction by sharing information and knowledge is the key to delivering online courses. Students must be able to navigate and access information. Email communications allowed instructor to respond quickly.

Methodology

An Internet web based data instrument was developed to collect data. The survey instrument created covered six areas of interest: demographics (questions 1-5), personal preferences and habits (questions 6-15), technological proficiency (questions 16-21), course evaluation (questions 22-27), online course structure (questions 28-41), and instructors' evaluation (questions 42-47). The instrument was piloted on 20 randomly selected MBA students. Modifications were done and the instrument was administered over five semesters from Spring 1999 to Spring 2001.

At the end of the Spring semester 1999 the first survey was conducted. Emails were sent to the students asking for their participation in an online survey for the study. They were given a Web URL address, user name and password. The instrument required the respondents to identify the courses they took to eliminate the need to code the instrument. Submitted surveys were emailed to the researcher. One follow-up email was sent to remind students that the surveys should be completed by the last week of the semester.

Fifty-seven students in the Spring of 1999 were taught in a regular classroom setting. Twenty-seven students in Special Problems, and Systems Design and Analysis in the Fall of 1999 and 56 students in two sections of Management Information Systems in the Spring 2000 took Web enhanced courses. The Management Information

Systems course was scheduled to meet twice a week on Tuesday and Thursday. The students agreed to meet in the classroom one day and online in Cyber-Class Level Two (text chat only) published by HyperGraphics one day. Email and text chats were used as a means of communication during online sessions.

Cyber-Class was straightforward and students had no problems navigating around the site. Students used asynchronous sharing of e-mail, bulletin board exchanges as conferencing tools, which is searchable and supports the use of attachments for file exchange. It provided learning tools that helped students with concepts and updated news articles.

The students also had a chance to compete with other students from other universities in the Cyber Challenge games. Several students received scores high enough to have the university listed. It was a continuous challenge each week to see if they could get scores high enough to keep the university listed. The games contained questions dealing with the concepts in the textbook. Table 1 lists the features available in Cyber-Class.

Assignments	Audio Classroom
Hot Links (interesting links to web sites)	Text Chat (Private chat room)
Cyber Challenge (Jeopardy-like game tests your mastery of the course materials)	Company Briefs (students learn how companies use/sell technology, scoops on job opportunities plus special student discounts)
Calendar	CyberNews (vital links to CyberClass news)
FlashCards (students practice how well they understand key terms and concepts)	Syllabus
Testing (Chapter/Instructor Test)	Student Administration (user name, grades)
Student Bulletin Board	Student Guide
Sending Messages (e-mail)	Technical Support (telephone, email and live text chat from 10 AM CST – 6 PM CST Monday – Friday)
View Messages	No activity in 4 hours automatically logs students out

Table 1. Cyber-Class

In text chat students were given a question and they typed their answer. The remaining students could agree, add to or disagree with the answer given. Everyone was given an opportunity to answer a question. Bonus questions were also offered. This method was ok, but still provided a problem for students who typed slowly. Assigning questions ahead of time or letting students pick their own questions helped those who typed slowly. The students were able to type their answer ahead of time in Word or Notepad and cut and paste their answer into text chat.

A few students using AOL browser had some technical difficulties during the semester. But the difficulties did not interfere substantially with the course. Students using AOL connection had difficulties during timed exams and quizzes; sometimes the Internet provider disconnected the students. Students using AOL browsers were advised to minimize the AOL browser and open another browser for the exa ms and quizzes.

In the instructor's effort to enhance the course moving the courses from Level Two (text chat) to Level Three (audio and text chats) in CyberClass provided synchronous sharing audio chat. The instructor, student and student's classmates could hear each other speak in the audio classroom. The voice chat enabled two or more to communicate via microphone in a speaker conference call style over the Internet connection in real time.

In the Fall of 2000 and Spring 2001 sixty-one students were strictly taking distance-learning courses using Cyber-Class with both text chat and audio chat. The audio chat room was a great enhancement to the class. This allowed the instructor and students to chat once a week. It was like having a face-to-face meeting without being physically present. Students only needed a sound card and microphone on their computer. Students did not seem to have major problems in moving from a classroom setting to an online teaching method.

In the online meetings weekly chapter reading and review questions were discussed. Each student was given a question to answer. Other students were encouraged to participate once the students' answer was given. Students were encouraged to share ideas, information, articles, books and TV news. This format enhanced students' participation because they did not have to type their answers. They could answer the question using a microphone, which gave the feeling of an in-class meeting. In this format students could concentrate on concepts of the materials rather than typing. Students could also send a private message to the instructor during the audio chat meeting if they had a problem.

Audio chats allowed students to have an interactive online learning environment via the Internet. Students also used the audio chat room for team meetings. This worked out well for the students, because they could be at home and still attend their team meetings. To prepare them for distance meetings and problem solving via the Internet, the students were instructed to hold all team meetings in the text or audio chat rooms.

In the Fall of 2001 the university adopted Web-CT format. All web enhanced or distance learning online courses were switched to Web-CT. When the courses were moved from Cyber-Class to Web-CT the audio chat room enhancements were lost. Web-CT offered text chat and a whiteboard facility, which included a shared text window that supported sharing drawing. The whiteboard allowed the use of standard image formats including JPEG, GIF and BMP. This was a step backward. Audio chat room enhancements allowed the instructor to communicate with students on one-to-one basis about concepts and issues, which was not available in Web-CT.

The sample for this study included 233 MBA students in CAU Business School. Regular program offered Management Information Systems, Special Problems in Decision Sciences, and Systems Analysis and Design. Weekend program offered Information Systems II, Information Systems III and Accounting Information Systems Analysis and Design. Survey questionnaires were collected Spring and Fall 1999, Spring and Fall 2000 and Spring 2001.

Out of 233 students there were 201 (86%) valid respondents. Regular students 158 (78.6%) and Weekend students 43 (21.4%) participated in the survey. There were 81 males and 119 females ranging from 21 to over 35 in age. The chi-square test of independence was used to analyze the data.

Findings

The demographics dimensions included age groups (21 to over 35), gender (female, male), majors (Decision Sciences, Finance, Marketing) and the semesters that online courses were taken. The study indicated that age group and MBA programs are related. Question 2 (Q2) "What group best represents your age?" Regular students 3.5% are in the youngest age group of 21-24, compared to 2.3% of the Weekend. On the other hand, only 9.5% of the Regular students are in the 35 and over, compared to 32.6% of the Weekend students ($p=0.000$). Q3 "What is your gender?" The study showed no significant difference between Regular and Weekend students.

In Q4 "What is your major?" showed a significant relationship between Regular/ Weekend programs and majors. Weekend students 68.3% are majoring in Finance compared to Regular students 38.1%, in contrast to Weekend students Marketing 31.7% compared to Regular students 47.8% ($p = 0.001$). Question Q5 "What semester/year did you complete your online course?" showed a significant relationship between Regular/ Weekend programs ($p = .044$).

In the subgroup analysis of Personal Preferences and Habits Q6 " How many miles do you drive to the CAU campus each day?" Students drove at least 11 miles to campus Regular 67.1% and Weekend 76.8%. In Q7 "Why did you decide to take this course?" Responses to fulfill a requirement and subject seemed interesting were Regular 61.4%, 28.5% compared to Weekend 88.4% and 2.2% respectively. It was interesting to note that two courses in the Regular program were electives for most students ($p = .002$).

Question Q8 "What is the highest degree you plan to earn from any college or university?" There were no significant differences between the two programs. However Ph.D. was selected by 26.6% of the Regular students compared to 14.0% of the Weekend students. Q9 asked, "Which of the following best describes your reason for taking college course at this time? To advance in current position and to discover new job opportunities were Regular 2.5%, 42.7% compared to Weekend 15.8% and 28.9% respectively ($p = 0.018$). More Weekend students were interested in advancing in current position while Regular students were interested in discovering new job opportunities.

Respondents were asked in Q10 "How many credit hours are you currently taking?" Students in the Regular program 63.2% were taking 13-15 credit hours compared to Weekend only 10.0%. On the other hand Weekend students 82.5% were taking 7-9 credit hours compared to Regular 4.9% ($p = 0.000$). Regular students were on semester credit hours and Weekend students were on trimester credit hours. Question Q11 asked, "How many hours per week do you work for pay?" Weekend 62.2% spend 21 or more hours working compared to Regular 37.8%. However Regular 29.1% spend 2-10 hours a week compared to Weekend 18.9% ($p = .031$). Q12 asked, "On average how many hours per week do you spend on campus for classes? More than half of the Weekend students 56.3% spend 6-10 hours on campus compared to Regular 46.7%. However Regular students 42.0% spend 11-20 hours compared to Weekend students 22.8% ($p =0.045$).

Q13 "On the average how many hours do you spend on campus working on course assignments in the lab?" All courses required case assignments. Regular and Weekend students spend 60% and 77.5% respectively on campus working on assignments ($p= 0.097$). Questions Q14 "On the average how many hours per week do you

spend working on team projects?" and Q15 "Requiring that students own laptop computers is a reasonable expectation of the business school" showed no significant differences between the programs.

In Q16 the statement "I can search for information on Internet/World Wide Web," Regular students 0.6% were novice users compared to Weekend 14.0%. More Weekend students 25.6% were expert user than Regular students 15.8% ($p = 0.001$). In Q17 the statement "I can electronically send and receive files by way of the computer (over a modem, the Internet/WWW etc.)," responses showed no significant differences between the two programs.

In Q18 "I have experience using online text chat and audio chat rooms," responses for audio chat rooms were Weekend students 28.6% compared to Regular 15.4%. On the other hand, text chat rooms were Regular students 19.2% compared to Weekend 7.1% ($p = 0.048$). With both programs using audio and text chat rooms, this study shows that these methods could enhance students' learning experiences.

Q19 "I feel comfortable using the World Wide Web for research purpose." and Q20 "How comfortable are you working on teams using email, text chat and audio chat rooms as primary communication tools?" were not significantly different between the two programs. Question 21 asked, "Did you have connection problems with your Internet provider? More Weekend students 44.2% responded Yes than Regular students 23.8%. Regular 76.2% responded No compared to Weekend 55.8% ($p = 0.009$). When the students were asked to name the providers, one Internet provider's name stood out more than others.

The following three question statements showed no significant differences between the two programs. Q22 "This course increased my knowledge and understanding of the subject matter," Q23 "This course required me to think and to analyze information." and Q24 "I understand and can apply the concepts I learned in this course."

In Q25 "This course increased my interest in the subject," Regular students 19.1% Strongly Disagreed (SD) or Disagreed (D) compared to Weekend students 7.1%. However Weekend students 85.7% Agreed (A) or Strongly Agreed (SA) compared to Regular 64.7% ($p = .031$). In Q26 "I found the course material challenging," Regular students 19.8% responded SD or D compared to Weekend students 4.6%. However Weekend students 69.9% responded (A) or (SA) compared to Regular 72.1% ($p = .049$). Q27 "I felt motivated to do my best work." showed no significant difference between the programs.

Students were asked to respond to the statement in Q28 "My course of study resulted in learning outcomes appropriate to the rigor and breadth of any traditional courses." was not significant. In Q29 "The presentation and organization of the course assignments and materials were coherent and complete." Weekend students 75.7% responded (A) or (SA) compared to Regular 65.6%. On the other hand Regular students 20.1% expressed (SD) or (D) compared to Weekend students 2.3% ($p = 0.087$). In Q30 "The instructor provided encouragement, support and feedback appropriate to meet my learning needs." Regular students 10.7% showed (SD) or (D) compared to Weekend students 7.0%. Regular students 71.9% responded (A) or (SA) compared to Weekend 55.8% ($p = .013$). It is important to give students quick responses to their questions or problems. Therefore online courses require prompt responses such as email or voice message communications.

The questions 31-38 showed no significant difference between the two programs. In Q39 "My course of study provided clear learning objectives and expected outcomes for the course." Regular 12.3% responded (D) or (SD) compared to Weekend 4.8%, while 85.7% of the Weekend students responded (A) or (SA) compared to Regular 63.0% ($p = .044$). The responses to Q40 "The delivery system or technology was reliable and stable" and Q41 "If all graduate students are required to have a laptop, do you think it would be fully integrated in most of your courses?" were not different between the programs.

The following three statements, Q42 "The instructor demonstrated concern and respect for students," Q43 "The instructor was patient and encouraged students' questions" and Q44 "The instructor was enthusiastic about the subject matter" did not show different responses between the programs.

The responses to Q45 "The instructor presented materials in a clear and understandable fashion" were Regular 14.2% (D) or (SD) compared to Weekend 0.0%. On the other hand Regular 72.9% responded (A) or (SA) compared to Weekend 76.8% ($p = .062$). Q 46 "The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the subject matter" was responded with Regular 6.6% (SD) or (D) compared to Weekend 0.0%. On the other hand Regular 83.5% students responded (A) or (SA) compared to Weekend 76.7% ($p = .021$). In Q47 "The instructor made effective use of relevant examples and illustrations", Regular 6.6% responded (SD) or (D) compared to Weekend 4.7%. Regular students responded 81.6% (A) or (SA) compared to Weekend 76.7% ($p = 0.022$).

Conclusions

Oliver (2000) stated "Evaluation is becoming increasingly important, both as a part of the design of online course and as a mechanism for quality assurance" (p. 83). This research has shown that online audio chat and text

chat had a positive effect on students' learning. A quick response helps students move from traditional to online. Working with students to understand the benefits, dangers and limitations helps them adjust to online course environments. Students taking online courses had more flexibility in their schedules, immediate feedback on test scores and seemed to enjoy expanding their technology skills while learning. Participation points and bulletin board discussion keep students actively involved each week. Online instructors are more in touch with their students because they need the continuous feedback. Using the audio and text chats allows the instructors to have interactions with their students while they learn concepts and technology.

The authors have found that it is pedagogically sound to use both audio and text chats to enhance online course delivery. In an effort to better understand the effectiveness of the audio and text chats further research is needed to make sure students learning experience is positive. Research should be used to modify or make changes to online courses as we move toward more flexible and creative methods of delivering online courses.

References

Adams, R. (2001). Do online education and training click? Retrieved October 31, 2001 from http://www.fastcompany.com/learning/braintrust/radams.html

Burnett, R (2000, December 4). Learning in the web. Interactive Week, 7(49), 122. California Distance Learning Project (CDLP) (2001). What is distance learning? Retrieved January 15, 2002 from http://www.cdlponline.org/dlinfo/cdlp1/distance/whatis.html

Culross, R. R. (Spring 2001). Applying a model of instructional design to web-bases courses for adult learners. The Journal of Continuing Higher Education, 49(2), 32-38.

Dunkin, A. (1998, October 19). Getting the most for your b-school money. Business Week, 176-178.

Kazlauskas, E. (2000-2001). Distance learning at USC – A research perspective. Faculty Forum The Newsletter of the USC Academic Senate 2(34). Retrieved October 29, 2001 from http://www.usc.edu/academe/acsen/info_for_faculty/newsletter/0001v2n34/0001vol2num34article04.shtml.

Langford B. E., Farinella, J. A. Weeks, Shelton & Hobbs, B. K. (2001, Spring). Distance delivery: A marketing faculty perspective. Journal of the Academy of Business Education, 2, 75-88.

Neil, T (February 2001). Assessing enrollment and attrition rates for the online mba. THE Journal, 28(7), 64-68.

Oas, B. (2000, September). Have it your way: Adaptive learning puts students in charge. Online Learning, 4(8), 39-40, 42.

Parviz, P. & Ludwig, S. (1999, November). Learning java internationally using webct. THE Journal, 27(4), p. 114, 4p.

Stevens, L. (1999, April). Online mba makes the grade. Internetweek, 761, 31.

****Due to page limitations appendices A, B and F have been dropped. Please email us if you would like to receive a copy of these appendices.**

APPENDIX C **Technological Proficiency Questions**	**N = 201**	**Regular N = 158**	**Weekend N = 43**	**X^2**
Q16. I can search for information on the Internet /World Wide Web.	No Knowledge	.6%	0.0%	21.755 [a] 0.001 [b]
	Knowledge, But No Ability	1.9%	0.0%	
	Novice User	.6%	14.0%	
	Casual User	3.8%	4.6%	
	Moderate User	17.1%	16.3%	
	Proficient User	60.1%	39.5%	
	Expert User	15.8%	25.6%	
Q17. I can electronically send and receive files by way of the computer (over a modem, the Internet/ WWW .etc).	Knowledge, But No Ability	1.0 %	0.0%	8.411 [a] 0.135 [b]
	Novice User	6.6%	0.0%	
	Casual User	5.3%	15.0%	
	Moderate User	13.9%	20.0%	
	Proficient User	50.3%	42.5%	
	Expert User	22.5%	22.5%	
Q18. I have experience using online text chat and audio chat	Audio Chat Rooms	15.4%	28.6%	6.072 [a]

rooms.	Text Chat Rooms	19.2%	7.1%	0.048 [b]
	Audio Chat Rooms & Text Chat Rooms	65.4%	64.3%	
Q19. I feel comfortable using the World Wide Web for research purposes.	SD	4.0%	2.3%	5.978 [a] 0.201 [b]
	D	5.8%	2.4%	
	N/O	9.0%	4.8%	
	A	21.2%	38.1%	
	SA	59.6%	52.4%	
Q20. How comfortable are you working on teams using email, chat and audio talk rooms as primary communication tools?	Very Comfortable	30.4%	34.1%	3.418 [a] 0.636 [b]
	Comfortable	17.7%	22.2%	
	Somewhat Comfortable	17.1%	14.6%	
	Neutral	12.0%	14.6%	
	Uncomfortable	16.5%	14.5%	
	Very Uncomfortable	6.3%	0.0%	
Q21. Did you have connecting problems with your Internet Provider?	YES	23.8%	44.2%	6.820 [a] 0.009 [b]
	NO	76.2%	55.8%	
APPENDIX D Course Evaluation Questions				
Q22. This course increased my knowledge and understanding of the subject matter.	SD	4.4%	4.7%	2.604 [a] 0.626 [b]
	D	5.8%	4.2%	
	N/O	12.2%	9.3%	
	A	52.6%	44.2%	
	SA	25.0%	37.2%	
Q23. This course required me to think and to analyze information.	SD	2.5%	0.0%	4.238 [a] 0.375 [b]
	D	10.9%	2.4%	
	N/O	9.6%	9.5%	
	A	41.7%	47.6%	
	SA	35.3%	40.5%	
Q24. I understand and can apply the concepts I learned in this course.	SD	3.2%	0.0%	5.930 [a] 0.204 [b]
	D	8.3%	0.0%	
	N/O	14.1%	14.3%	
	A	46.2%	47.6%	
	SA	28.2%	38.1%	
Q25. This course increased my interest in the subject.	SD	2.5%	0.0%	10.645 [a] 0.031 [b]
	D	16.6%	7.1%	
	N/O	10.8%	7.1%	
	A	44.6%	35.7%	
	SA	20.1%	50.0%	
Q26. I found the course materials challenging.	SD	1.3%	0.0%	9.513 [a] 0.049 [b]
	D	18.5%	4.6%	
	N/O	10.3%	23.3%	
	A	45.5%	51.2%	
	SA	24.4%	20.9%	
Q27. I felt motivated to do my best work.	SD	.6%	0.0%	3.024 [a] 0.554 [b]
	D	9.6%	7.1%	
	N/O	16.0%	19.0%	
	A	42.3%	31.0%	
	SA	31.4%	42.9%	
APPENDIX E Online Course Structure Questions				
Q28. My course of study resulted in learning outcomes appropriate to the rigor and breadth of any traditional course.	SD	3.8%	0.0	*4.243 [a] 0.374 [b]
	D	11. 5%	4.5%	
	N/O	19.9%	18.8%	
	A	44.2%	55.8%	
	SA	20.5 %	20.9%	
Q29. The presentation and organization of the course assignments and materials was coherent and complete.	SD	1.9%	0.0%	8.118* 0.087 [b]
	D	18.2%	2.3%	
	N/O	14.3%	22.0%	
	A	49.4%	53.7%	
	SA	16.2%	22.0%	
Q30. The instructor provided encouragement, support, and feedback appropriate to meet my learning needs.	SD	5.3%	0.0%	12.703 [a] 0.013
	D	5.4%	7.0%	
	N/O	17.4%	37.2%	

	A	47.7%	25.6%	
	SA	24.2%	30.2%	
Q31. My course of study provided interaction between faculty and students to meet my needs.	SD	2.6%	2.4%	1.869 [a]
	D	10.4%	11.9%	0.760 [b]
	N/O	20.1%	21.4%	
	A	50.6%	40.5%	
	SA	16.2%	23.8%	
Q32. I had reasonable and adequate access to the range of student services all appropriate to support my learning needs and style.	SD	1.3%	0.0%	3.621 [a]
	D	11.2%	7.0%	0.460 [b]
	N/O	25.7%	16.3%	
	A	43.4%	55.8%	
	SA	18.4%	20.9%	
Q33. I was provided enough in formation (through advising or orientation) to determine if I had the background, knowledge, and technical skills needed to be successful in this course.	SD	7.1%	4.6%	1.113 [a]
	D	5.2%	7.0 %	0.892 [b]
	N/O	24.5%	27.9%	
	A	47.7%	41.9%	
	SA	15.5%	18.6%	
Q34. The advising, recruiting, and admissions materials clearly and accurately represent the course and the services available	SD	5.8%	0.0	7.097 [a]
	D	13.6%	18.5%	0.131 [b]
	N/O	27.3%	41.9%	
	A	39.0%	25.6%	
	SA	14.3%	14.0%	
Q35. I would recommend or consider taking another course using the same vehicle.	SD	5.9%	6.9%	5.537 [a]
	D	15.8%	14.0%	0.237 [b]
	N/O	17.8%	14.0%	
	A	28.9%	46.5%	
	SA	31.6%	18.6%	
Q36. I felt uncomfortable using the audio equipment necessary for my distance-learning course.	SD	12.9%	9.3%	6.134 [a]
	D	18.7%	30.2%	0.189 [b]
	N/O	15.5%	4.7%	
	A	28.4%	34.9%	
	SA	24.5%	20.9%	
Q37. The course ensured that appropriate learning resources are available to students. (links to related supporting web sites and traditional library resources)	SD	3.9%	7.0%	6.674 [a]
	D	7.1%	4.7%	0.154 [b]
	N/O	19.5%	9.3%	
	A	48.1%	41.7%	
	SA	21.4%	37.2%	
Q38. The mode of delivery did NOT cause frustration or difficulty in completing the course successfully.	SD	5.2%	4.6%	2.847 [a]
	D	23.5%	34.9%	0.584 [b]
	N/O	13.1%	11.6%	
	A	43.8%	32.6%	
	SA	14.4%	16.3%	
Q39. My course of study provided clear learning objectives and expected outcomes for the course.	SD	3.2%	2.4%	9.821 [a]
	D	9.1%	2.4%	0.044 [b]
	N/O	24.7%	9.5%	
	A	42.2%	47.6%	
	SA	20.8%	38.1%	
Q40. The delivery system or technology was reliable and stable.	SD	6.4%	7.0%	6.874 [a]
	D	22.3%	9.3%	0.143 [b]
	N/O	17.2%	30.2%	
	A	36.3%	41.9	
	SA	17.8%	11.6%	
Q41. If all graduate students are required to have a laptop, do you think it would be fully integrated in most of your courses?	YES	87.1%	87.5%	0.001 [a] 0.969 [b]

SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, N/O = No Opinion, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree

[a] = Chi-Square Value **[b] = Approximately Significant**

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").